

I am outraged by Sinclair's decision to limit public debate in this presidential election year by using \*my\* airwaves to promote its own agenda. Unlike me, Sinclair cannot vote, does not serve on juries and should not have the right to sculpt the public debate to its own purposes by refusing programming from national providers.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.